Case 2:04-cv-02187-LKK-PAN Document 5 Filed 06/16/05 Page 1 of 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DIANNE SUSAN NORMAN, Plaintiff, CIV. S-04-2187-LKK PAN V. JO ANNE B. BARNHART, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS Commissioner of Social Security, Defendant. $-\circ\bigcirc\circ-$ On October 15, 2004, plaintiff filed a complaint seeking review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying plaintiff's application for disability benefits. On

On October 15, 2004, plaintiff filed a complaint seeking review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying plaintiff's application for disability benefits. On March 21, 2005, plaintiff was ordered to show cause in writing within 11 days why this action should not be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) for failure to serve process within 120 days after the complaint was filed, or by February 12, 2005.

Case 2:04-cv-02187-LKK-PAN Document 5 Filed 06/16/05 Page 2 of 4

On May 16, 2005, nearly two months after the issuance of the order to show cause, plaintiff's counsel filed the following response:

I, David M. Shore, declare:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

26

- I apologize to the court that this response was not timely offered.
- 2. I do not know why this case was filed but not timely served, but it is my responsibility. I have sent this matter out for service by certified mail and will file such proof of service upon receipt.
- 3. I know that I have had administrative difficulties in the past and have tried to ensure that all motions are promptly filed. For whatever reason, I have had some matters filed but not served. I have taken it upon myself to ensure that each of these matters are properly served.
- I respectfully request that the Order to Show Cause be 4. dismissed.

Nearly one more month has passed and plaintiff's counsel has not filed proof of service upon defendant.

Absent a showing of good cause, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) directs the court to dismiss an action without prejudice "upon 16 motion or on its own initiative after notice to the plaintiff," if service of the summons and complaint have not been timely made. "When considering a motion to dismiss a complaint for untimely service, courts must determine whether good cause for the delay has been shown on a case by case basis. Cartage Pac., Inc. v. Waldner (In re Waldner), 183 B.R. 879, 882 (9th Cir. BAP1995). We have recognized that '[a]t a minimum, "good cause" means excusable neglect.' Boudette v. Barnette, 923 F.2d 754, $24 \parallel 756$ (9th Cir. 1991). In <u>Boudette</u>, we stated that a plaintiff may be required to show the following factors in order to bring the excuse to the level of good cause: '(a) the party to be served

Case 2:04-cv-02187-LKK-PAN Document 5 Filed 06/16/05 Page 3 of 4

received actual notice of the lawsuit; (b) the defendant would suffer no prejudice; and (c) plaintiff would be severely prejudiced if his complaint were dismissed.' Id. (citing Hart v. United States, 817 F.2d 78, 80-81 (9th Cir. 1987))." In respectively.

Sheehan, 253 F.3d 507, 512 (9th Cir. 2001).

Plaintiff has failed to satisfy any of these factors or assert any other basis demonstrating good cause for failure timely to effect service upon defendant.

Accordingly, I recommend this action be dismissed without prejudice. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) (dismissal warranted for "failure of the plaintiff to . . . comply with these rules or any order of court"); E. D. Cal. L. R. 11-110 ("[f]ailure of . . . a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the court").

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the Honorable Lawrence K. Karlton, the United States District Judge assigned to this case. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Written objections may be filed within ten days after being served with these findings and recommendations. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The failure to file objections within the

25 ////

26 ////

Case 2:04-cv-02187-LKK-PAN Document 5 Filed 06/16/05 Page 4 of 4

1	specifi	ed time	may wai	ve the	e right	to ap	peal	the Di	strict	Court's
2	order.	Martine	ez v. Yl	<u>st</u> , 95	51 F.2d	1153	(9th	Cir. 1	991).	
3		Dated:	June 1	5, 200	5.					
4						/s/ P	eter .	A. Now	inski	
5								OWINSK Judge		
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23 24										
25										
_ J										